#### Message

**From**: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV] **Sent**: 3/28/2018 9:17:33 PM

**To**: Chesnutt, John [Chesnutt.John@epa.gov]

**Subject**: Felicia can ask for \$20K FW: Hunters Point Naval Site - Burn Rate?

From: Barnett, Felicia

Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 1:56 PM

To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>

Subject: RE: Hunters Point Naval Site - Burn Rate?

Lily:

As an FYI, the FY18 money is now coming in and mostly likely the SCMTSC can supply some funds for Hunter's Point work.

I'll know in a week and will let you know.

It will not cover everything, but I suspect, I will have around \$20k we can use as you find more site money.

## Felicia Barnett, Director

ORD Site Characterization and Monitoring Technical Support Center (SCMTSC) Superfund and Technology Liaison, Region 4 USEPA 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303 (404) 562-8659

From: LEE, LILY

Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2018 11:38 AM

To: Barnett, Felicia < Barnett. Felicia@epa.gov >

Subject: RE: Hunters Point Naval Site - Burn Rate?

Yikes! We used her a lot this past month. You'll need new \$ soon

From: Barnett, Felicia

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 27, 2018 8:36 AM **To:** LEE, LILY < <u>LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV</u>>

**Cc:** Cook, Anna-Marie < Cook.Anna-Marie@epa.gov> **Subject:** RE: Hunters Point Naval Site - Burn Rate?

Hi Lily:

Here is the Accounting since the September of 2017

8/28 - 9/24/17 - \$ 6,653.27

9/25 - 10/29/17 - \$14,277.06 10/30 - 11/26/17 - \$ 3,318.39 11/27 - 12/31/17 - \$13,648.15

1/01 - 2/04/18 - \$ 3412.20 - At this point you exhausted all the previous funding and we took out about \$1200

from the \$20k you sent.

2/05 - 3/04/18 -\$ 4846.31 - At this point you can estimate you have about \$13k to be safe.

Hope this helps and we'll get to work on the new document.

# Felicia Barnett, Director

ORD Site Characterization and Monitoring Technical Support Center (SCMTSC) Superfund and Technology Liaison, Region 4 USEPA 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303 (404) 562-8659

From: LEE, LILY

**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2018 4:39 PM **To:** Barnett, Felicia < <u>Barnett, Felicia@epa.gov</u>> **Subject:** RE: Hunters Point Naval Site - Burn Rate?

Thanks! It's not a rush, since I have just made an estimate based on what I already know. I hope you had a good trip.

From: Barnett, Felicia

**Sent:** Thursday, March 22, 2018 1:24 PM **To:** LEE, LILY < LEE, LILY @EPA.GOV>

**Subject:** RE: Hunters Point Naval Site - Burn Rate?

I have the ones through January but am requesting an update on February and this month. I was on travel but will get them to you by the first of next week.

### Felicia

From: LEE, LILY

Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 7:10 PM

To: Barnett, Felicia < Barnett, Felicia@epa.gov >

Subject: RE: Hunters Point Naval Site - Burn Rate?

Dear Felicia,

I wanted to see if you have the amts we used in recent months, e.g. since October 2017. I know that I asked her to do especially a lot in October, January, Feb, March. I'm not sure what the future need will be, so I'm trying to figure out the future need.

From: Barnett, Felicia

Sent: Wednesday, March 14, 2018 9:38 AM

To: LEE, LILY < LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>

Subject: RE: Hunters Point Naval Site - Funding now almost used.

Hi Lily:

I have not seen February's burn yet but we were basically at \$0 at the end of January and started on the \$20k for February. I should have that any time and will let you know but I would say given the work done, we are well into the \$20k by now.

If I do not have an idea by first of next week, I will get that for you.

## Felicia Barnett, Director

ORD Site Characterization and Monitoring Technical Support Center (SCMTSC) Superfund and Technology Liaison, Region 4 USEPA 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303 (404) 562-8659

From: LEE, LILY

**Sent:** Thursday, January 25, 2018 10:21 AM **To:** Barnett, Felicia <a href="mailto:sarnett.Felicia@epa.gov">sarnett.Felicia@epa.gov</a>

Subject: Re: Hunters Point Naval Site - Funding now almost used.

Thank you for letting me know. Let me talk to my boss.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 25, 2018, at 5:34 AM, Barnett, Felicia <Barnett.Felicia@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Lily:

I have received the numbers for December and there were a lot of hours spent last month – amounting to over \$10k of work. You now have only a few thousand left. I do not know how much more work you need from Donna but I suspect we will deplete the funds this month or next.

How do you wish to proceed?

# Felicia Barnett. Director

ORD Site Characterization and Monitoring Technical Support Center (SCMTSC) Superfund and Technology Liaison, Region 4 USEPA 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303 (404) 562-8659

From: Barnett, Felicia

**Sent:** Monday, January 22, 2018 7:47 AM **To:** LEE, LILY < LEE.LILY @EPA.GOV>

Subject: RE: Hunters Point Naval Site - Funding

Hi Lily:

As an FYI,

I wanted to let you know that I just paid the November invoices and as of the end of November, we have \$15k of funding left for work on Hunter's point. I wanted to make sure you knew the numbers as I know Hunter's is sill on a timeline.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

# Felicia Barnett, Director

ORD Site Characterization and Monitoring Technical Support Center (SCMTSC) Superfund and Technology Liaison, Region 4 USEPA 61 Forsyth Street Atlanta, GA 30303 (404) 562-8659

From: Getty, Donna J. [mailto:Donna J. Getty@leidos.com]

**Sent:** Friday, January 19, 2018 2:48 PM

To: LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>; Barnett, Felicia <Barnett.Felicia@epa.gov>

Cc: richard.m.leuser < richard.m.leuser@leidos.com>

Subject: Hunters Point Naval Site - Explanation of Item Sampling

Lily,

Below is a brief description of item sampling in respect to how it may be applied to Hunter Point.

### PRESENCE/ABSENCE SAMPLING

The potential for the use of presence/absence sampling as a method for clearance has been discussed with the EPA Regulators. Visual Sample Plan (VSP) software was used to compute some possible scenarios as a demonstration of how item sampling works. The population of Trench Units (TUs) (N=63) located on Parcel G are used as an example. In this design, each TU is considered to be an item. Sampling results are categorized as binary as per VSP:

"...this design requires that each sample result be categorized as a binary outcome, such as 1) the presence or absence of a particular quality, 2) a sample result being acceptable or unacceptable as defined by an action level threshold, 3) contamination being detected or not detected, etc. "

Additionally,

"The objective of this design is to demonstrate, with high probability, that a high percentage of the decision area (or population) is acceptable, where none of the observed samples may be unacceptable." For Parcel G:

- 1) The 2 levels of confidence are set. For example, "I want to be 95% confident that 95% of the 63 TUs are acceptable."
- 2) A decision is made whether to include targeted TUs in addition to randomly selected TUs. This also requires, an input as to how much more likely the targeted TUs are to be unacceptable as compared to the remaining TUs. For example: "I believe that a target TU is 2 times more likely to be unacceptable"
- 3) Based on the above two inputs, the number of targeted and the number of random TUs to be evaluated is computed using VSP.
- 4) Each of the TUs selected for evaluation undergo (a subset of the 63 TUs) a MARSSIM Class 1- based scan/sampling process.
- 5) If at the end of the Class 1 process for the subset of TUs, any of the evaluated TUs is determined to be unacceptable, then the preset confidence levels will no longer hold, and it requires all TUs undergo a MARSSIM Class 1 process.

Some example calculations are presented below.

For a sampling design where all TUs for evaluation are selected randomly:

- If one wants to be 99% confident that 95% of the items (TUs) are acceptable then 48 TUs selected randomly must meet criteria.
- If one wants to be 95% confident that 95% of the TUs are acceptable then 39 TUs selected randomly must meet criteria.
- If one wants to be 61% confident that 95% of the TUs are acceptable then 16 (25% of 63) TUs selected randomly must meet criteria.

For a sampling design with targeted and randomly selected TUs:

• If I believe that a targeted TU is 2 times more likely to be unacceptable and I want to sample 16 targeted TUs then I need to sample an additional 7 random TUs. If all of the combined (random and targeted) TUs meet criteria then I can be at least 95% confident that 95% of the TUs meet criteria.

### **UNCERTAINTIES**

Item sampling is not included in MARSSIM and is not typically used in this manner. It applies to grid cells across a region (a wall, a floor, etc), a group of drums, etc. where a single sample (wipe sample) dictates the presence/absence of the contamination. For Hunters Point, the Class 1 MARSSIM approach requires scanning 100% of the region followed by multiple sample collection and statistical analysis. The final binary answer, acceptable or unacceptable, is based on multiple lines of evidence not a single sample.

### Donna J. Getty | Leidos

Statistician | SERAS mobile: 215.962.9929

donna.j.getty@leidos.com | leidos.com/civil

<image001.png>